

## REMARKS

Applicants' remarks, below, are preceded by quotations of the related comments of the Examiner, in small, boldface type.

### *Claim Rejections – 35 USC §103*

\*\*\*\*


1. Claims 1, 5-6, 7-10, 25-31, and 33-37, is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 1-3(a) as being unpatentable over Pierson in view of Livingston (1,538,196).

Pierson discloses in fig. 1 a stator support system for supporting a coil comprising: a inner support tube having an outer surface (10), a plurality of spaced winding (30) supported on the outer surface of the inner support tube, spaced between adjacent windings defining a plurality of wedges (12) having an upper and lower edge (A&B) configured to mechanically engage the outer surface of the support tube and a circular cross support (32) positioned over the plurality of spaced windings and extending perpendicular to a longitudinal axis of the stator coil assembly. Wherein the cross support has a first edge. Pierson do not disclose a plurality of spaced cross support members having a plurality of wedges configured with notches and a magnetic material disposed with in one channel having high permeability.

Livingston discloses in fig. 1-5 a stator support system having a plurality of spaced cross support members (10) is form of iron having a magnetic material disposed in at least one channel (13) made of iron laminate. ...

Amended claims 1 and 33 each require two cross support members that are *spaced apart* to define a channel *oriented perpendicular to the longitudinal axis of the radial opening*. The Examiner acknowledges that Pierson does not disclose a multiple cross support members, but argues that Livingston has cross support members (10) with spaces between adjacent cross support members defining at least one channel (13).

However, as plainly seen in Figure 1 of the Livingston patent reproduced below, none of Livingston's cross support members are spaced apart, but rather are completely flush with one another. Additionally, the channel defined by the cross-support members in Livingston runs parallel to the longitudinal axis of the radial opening of the motor, not perpendicular as required by the claims.



Thus, Livingston plainly fails to describe or suggest two cross support members that are *spaced apart* to define a channel *oriented perpendicular to the longitudinal axis of the radial opening* as required by claims 1 and 33. Applicant respectfully submits these claims are patentable for at least these reasons. Dependent claims 3-10 and 25-32 depend from claim 1 and claims 34-37 depend from claim 33 and are therefore also patentable for at least the same reasons.

For at least the above reasons, Applicant respectfully submit that all pending claims are patentable. Please note that the fact that the Applicant has addressed certain comments of the Examiner does not mean that the applicant concedes any other positions of the Examiner. The fact that the Applicant has asserted certain grounds for the patentability of a claim does not mean that there are not other good grounds for patentability of that claim or other claims.


Enclosed is a check \$1480.00 check for the Petition for Extension of Time fee. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Applicant : Bruce B. Gamble et al.  
Serial No. : 09/632,601  
Filed : August 4, 2000  
Page : 8 of 8

Attorney's Docket No.: 05770-124001 / AMSC-491

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 2/6/04

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Stephen L. Romine  
Reg. No. 43,056

Fish & Richardson P.C.  
225 Franklin Street  
Boston, MA 02110-2804  
Telephone: (617) 542-5070  
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906

20788180.doc